



Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

Meeting Summary FINAL

Lower San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #8

Time: April 20th, 2010, 12:30 pm – 4:30 pm

Location: San Joaquin Farm Bureau
3290 N Ad Art Rd
Stockton, CA 95215

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

Present:

Name	Organization	Status
Jeremy Arrich	DWR	Chief, Central Valley Flood Planning Office
Roger Churchwell	San Joaquin Area Flood Control (SJAFCA)	Member
Susan Dell'Osso	Reclamation District 2062	Member
Jim Giottonini	City of Stockton, SJAFCA	Member
John Green	Stockton East Water District	Member
Mary Hildebrand	San Joaquin Farm Bureau, South Delta Water Agency, California Central Valley Flood Association	Member
Dave Peterson	San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency	Member
Steve Winkler	San Joaquin County	Member
Joe Bartlett	DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Office (CVFPO)	CVFPO Representative
Roger Lee	DWR	DEW Lead
Carolyn Lott	Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)	Facilitator
Noel Lerner	DWR	Executive Sponsor
Sam Magill	Center For Collaborative Policy	Facilitation Support
Roger Putty	MWH	Technical Lead
John Shelton	DFG	Member
Yung-Hsin Sun	MWH	Technical Project Manager
Scott Woodland	DWR	Regional Coordinator

Absent:

Deedee Antypas	RD 2074	Member
Koosun Kim	City of Manteca	Member
Kevin Kaufman	Stockton East Water District	Member
Tony Refuerzo	Stanislaus County Planning Department	Member
David Zezulak	California Department of Fish and Game	Member
Wes Fujitani	City of Lodi	Member

Julie Retner	River Partners	Member
--------------	----------------	--------

WORK GROUP ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK

1. Noel Lerner will send contact information for Keith Swanson and Mark List, DWR, to Steve Winkler.
2. Work Group members will review the RCR and IPS1 and provide staff with any comments by May 14th.
3. Sam Magill will distribute the link to the final version of the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC) Descriptive Document to Lower San Joaquin Regional Conditions Work Group (Work Group) participants. (*Note: available online at <http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp/>*)
4. Staff will send copies of the Regional Conditions Report – A Working Document (RCR), Interim Progress Summary No. 1 (IPS1), and Reader's Guide to the IPS1 and RCR on CD to Work Group members unable to download it.
5. DWR will develop materials describing management actions and their relationship to regional solution sets for work group members in Phase 2 of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) process.
6. Work Group members will notify staff immediately of their availability to participate in CVFPP Phase II.

GROUP RECAP (meeting highlights for use by Work Group partners in their communications)

On April 20th, 2010, the Work Group concluded its work on Phase1 of the CVFPP.

The Work Group's purpose is the development of content for the RCR and IPS1, key components for developing the 2012 CVFPP. The RCR and IPS1 characterizes regional conditions within the Central Valley, describes flood management-related problems and associated opportunities within the Central Valley, describes the draft goals, principles, and initial objectives for the 2012 CVFPP. The Work Group is one of five regional work groups in the Central Valley.

MEETING GOALS:

1. Close Phase1 work
2. Determine Work Group perspectives regarding the accuracy and approach of the RCR and IPS1
3. Orient Work Group members on the revised process of developing the 2012 Central Valley Flood Protection Plan
4. Review and augment Phase1 assessment findings
5. Describe next steps in the process, Work Groups, and opportunities for involvement – invite participation in the next phase

SUMMARY:

****ALL PRESENTATIONS AND MATERIALS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT
www.water.ca.gov/cvfmp****

Welcome and Greetings

Carolyn Lott opened the meeting and introduced Jeremy Arrich, Chief of the Central Valley Flood Planning Office. Mr. Arrich explained his previous experience includes 4 years in flood operations and inspections for DWR as well as work with CALFED and in-Delta storage projects. He noted DWR is committed to have more involvement from executive sponsors and DWR leadership in future phases of the CVFPP. Phase 2 of the CVFPP will include work groups and current Work Group members are invited to participate in the next phase and DWR work to include their current input in the CVFPP.

Opening Remarks and Orientation

Noel Lerner, Flood Projects Office Chief, introduced himself as the new DWR executive sponsor for the Work Group. His office supports CVFMP efforts with technical work and also implements on-the-ground projects. He stressed the importance of engaging stakeholders in venues like the Work Group to gain first hand experience of local conditions. Mr. Arrich added that DWR is developing best management practices for addressing rodent issues for use by local reclamation districts and flood control agencies.

Discussion:

- A participant asked how DWR levees performed in the most recent round of inspections. Mr. Lerner responded there were no levees that failed the inspection and that levee conditions have improved since 2009. Although there are some issues with elderberries and pump stations, as a whole state levees performed well (especially in the Sacramento and Sutter Bypasses). Rodents are also an issue.
- Participants asked for a tour of “certified” and passing levees. Mr. Lerner will send participants the appropriate contact information of DWR employees who can set up tours (**see Action Item #1**).

Regional Conditions Report and Interim Progress Summary #1

RCR

Roger Lee delivered a presentation on the RCR and IPS1. This presentation is available at the website listed above. The RCR and IPS1 are the primary outcomes of Phase 1 of the CVFPP process. Staff stressed that although these documents represent a “snapshot” of local conditions right now and will not be substantially revised, they are “working documents” and any input from the Work Group will be carried into future phases of the CVFPP process. Comments on the documents are due May 14th and will be utilized for the assessment of Phase 1, to help inform Phase II, and incorporated into future documents as appropriate (**see Action Item #2**).

Joe Bartlett discussed the organization of the RCR. The RCR is divided into five main chapters: an introduction, the project area description, problems and opportunities, and goals and principles, and initial draft objectives. Instead of having standalone objectives, the RCR includes “objective categories.” These objectives are broad metrics for success in meeting CVFPP goals, and will be further refined in Phase 2.

RCR Discussion:

- A participant asked whether the RCR reflects comments made in the Work Group. Staff responded that it does, but a balancing effort was utilized to accurately represent input from the other four regional conditions work groups and topic work groups. The goal was to pull

out common themes from all of the work groups, although divergent opinions were recorded as well.

- Work Group members asked whether there will be an Environmental Impact Report for the CVFPP, and when scoping will happen. Staff responded a programmatic environmental impact report (PEIR) will be completed for the CVFPP using the RCR to help establish baseline conditions. Per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines, separate scoping and public comment meetings will be held in the future.
- A participant asked if the boundaries for the RCR and CVFPP correspond to larger FloodSAFE boundaries. Staff responded the CVFPP boundaries correspond to the SPFC boundaries, as described in the SPFC Descriptive Document. FloodSAFE boundaries include everything in the SPFC, but also have a broader, statewide focus.
- A participant commented the CVFPP should look at the entire system and noted limiting it to the SPFC alone may be ineffective. Ken Kirby responded that the authorizing legislation for the CVFPP also says to look at systemwide benefits. Actions outside of the SPFC would be considered if they improve flood protection within the SPFC. In other words, the only thing the CVFPP won't do is limit itself to projects *outside* of the SPFC. Mr. Kirby also noted under FloodSAFE DWR has initiated a Statewide Flood Management Planning Program to assess flood risk statewide. Staff will send the link to the SPFC Descriptive Document to Work Group members for further information (**see Action Item #3**).
- Participants noted it was difficult to download the full RCR from the website, and requested a CD of the material. Staff will send out CDs immediately (**see Action Item #4**).

IPS1

Mr. Lee and Mr. Bartlett delivered an overview of the IPS1. One IPS will be produced for each phase of the CVFPP for a total of four documents. The IPS1 provides an overview of CVFPP activities to date, interim findings, and an assessment of Phase I. It also provides an overview of future phases. The schedule for future phases is discussed in more detail below.

Feedback on Report/ Discussion Questions

Ms. Lott introduced a series of discussion questions on the IPS1 and RCR. The discussion questions document is available online at the address listed above. The following comments were recorded:

Question 1: Representation of Work Group Member Input

- A participant noted that CVFPP regions do not have dedicated sections in the RCR, and that Lower San Joaquin issues are spread throughout the document. Although this is primarily a structural issue in the document, staff may wish to change the title from "Regional Conditions Report" to "Systemwide Conditions Report." Staff concurred. The participant added that integrating
- Work Group members asked who the audience for the RCR is. Mr. Kirby responded the RCR is intended to be used by work groups and agencies as a stepping stone towards the final CVFPP. The structure is intended to promote understanding across regions and to help DWR synthesize its understanding of conditions and issues across all regions. The final CVFPP could end up being more of "regionalized" set of recommendations than the current RCR. Developing regionalized solution sets will be the focus of Phase 3.
- A participant noted although the RCR is a very large document, all work group data and suggestions appear to be included.

Question 2: RCR Goals and Scope

- Participants commented "economic growth" is not explicitly captured in the goals and scope. Mr. Kirby concurred, and said although economic growth is captured implicitly, staff will work to call it out more directly. It is specifically mentioned in the broader FloodSAFE goals.

- A member commented DFG employees have been approached by a number of willing sellers to convert their agricultural land into habitat. Although it is based on the willing seller principle, such sales could have impacts on local economies.

Question 3: Identifying RCR/IPS1 Gaps

- One member commented the map legend on page 6 of the IPS1 refers to state liability. Staff concurred, and noted this was an error and would change it to read “responsibility.” This and other changes, including to missing data from the “Contributing Factors Table”, will be updated by staff immediately (in subsequent discussions, staff agreed to post a corrected version of the document to the website).

Question 4: Suggestions for IPS Improvement

- Work Group members commented that the IPS1 serves its function as a briefing document and summary of CVFPP work to date.
- A participant commented that some statements in the IPS1 are made as generalities, even though they might only apply to specific areas or regions. One example was groundwater recharge: although it should be considered a goal where appropriate, some soil types do not readily promote recharge. Mr. Kirby responded that the RCR and IPS1 were intended to capture various perspectives. Some of these perspectives may be opinion based.
- One member commented when the PEIR process begins, data will have to be characterized as fact.
- A participant commented that it could be good to move the interim findings section of the IPS1 to the front of the document to catch the readers’ attention. Mr. Kirby responded that individual briefing sheets will be made for legislators and legislative staff, and future phases will lend themselves to a revised IPS organization.
- A participant noted that funding for maintenance and funding for improvements are very different things and should be considered separate issues. Mr. Kirby agreed, and said in future phases this change would be made.
- One member suggested the phrase “declining federal cost share” on page 19 should be revised to read “decreasing federal cost share.” Staff agreed and said the change would be made to this page and also to the corresponding page in the RCR.

Review of Phase 1 Assessment

Ms. Lott provided an overview of the Phase 1 Assessment. The Assessment was carried out by CVFPP facilitation staff and consisted of phone calls and one-on-one interviews with work group participants. Interviewees included regular participants in the process as well as work group members unable to participate in meetings. Work Group members had a largely favorable opinion of the process, but noted they will withhold judgment until the final CVFPP is released. Those interviewed said maintaining transparency throughout the process is critically important for the success of the CVFPP. Ms. Lott noted additional assessments will be carried out throughout the remainder of the process.

Overview of Phase 2 and Next Steps

Noel Lerner and Roger Putty provided an overview of Phase 2 and the immediate next steps. Phase 2 will focus on the development of management actions. Many of these actions were already identified by all work group members in Phase 1. The 800+ actions already identified will be carried forward into Phase 2 and screened into categories. All work groups will be allowed to provide input on this process. These categories will be associated with specific actions, but will not get to the project-specific levels. As discussed above, specific regional solution sets will be developed in Phase 3 of the CVFPP process. An “action” in this sense is a structural or non-structural project that can be used to achieve the goals of the CVFPP. A “solution” is a package of actions taken to address specific issues in each region.

Discussion:

- A participant asked if the final CVFPP recommendations will be programmatic or specific, deficiency correcting actions. Mr. Kirby replied that the recommendations will be programmatic, but will be “actionable.” It is not intended to be a Feasibility Study with specific structural projects.
- One member asked if recommendations will look at funding options. Staff responded that there will be screening criteria in Phase 2, including funding viability, as well as specific funding discussions in Phase 4 regarding implementation.
- A participant asked if DWR can develop a mock up management action, regional solution set, and system wide solution set for work group discussion in future phases. Mr. Kirby responded DWR will develop materials describing the relationship between the management actions and regional solution sets for Phase 2 (**see Action Item #5**).
- A Work Group member commented that the scientific credibility of assumptions is important, and noted variability in data for issues like climate change could have significant implications for the CVFPP.

After a discussion of the management actions, Mr. Putty delivered a presentation on the Phase 2 schedule. Like Phase 1, Phase 2 will be centered on regional work groups. After an initial round of work group meetings, public workshops and topic work groups will be convened. Input from these venues will be taken back to the regional work groups for further refinement. At the end of Phase 2, staff will produce IPS2. The first regional work group meetings are planned for early June. Workshops and topic work group meetings are planned for mid to late June. Additional regional work group meetings will be held throughout the summer. Completion of Phase 2 is expected in late August/ September 2010.

Discussion:

- A participant asked who the intended audience of the workshops is. Staff responded workshops are primarily for all work group members to come together to discuss management actions as a whole. The intention is to have the initial list of 800+ management actions categorized and filtered in advance of the workshops.
- Work Group members commented that it could be useful for regional work group members to deliver periodic updates to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) on CVFPP progress. CVFPB members or staff could also be brought to work group meetings. Staff agreed. One suggestion was to bring the entire CVFPB to one of the workshops as a “field trip.”
- A participant asked what the topic work groups will consist of. Yung-Hsin Sun responded in Phase 1, these groups were organized as topic specific “task forces” to figure out specific issues. In Phase 2, they will be used to define specific management actions. Topic work groups will also be used in Phases 3 and 4.
- One person asked when the PEIR process will start. Mr. Sun responded that the PEIR timeline is being developed right now, but it will have to start in 2010 to be finished in time with the 2012 CVFPP deadline.
- A member asked why there were two separate topic work groups listed for financing and revenue and economics. Mr. Sun responded that financing and revenue speaks to project specific funding, while economics speaks more to an overall cost benefit analysis.

After the schedule discussion, Ms. Lott asked for volunteers for the Phase 2 Lower San Joaquin Regional Work Group. Staff noted all members of the Phase 1 Work Group are guaranteed a spot in Phase 2. The following suggestions for membership were made:

- Stanislaus County representatives
- River Partners
- US Fish and Wildlife Service (refuge manager)
- US Army Corps of Engineers, particularly for vegetation guidance
- Academics from the University of the Pacific (Business Forecast Center; School of Engineering), CSU Stanislaus, and UC Merced (Climate Change)
- Resource Conservation District and Natural Resources Conservation Service representatives

Updates and Q&A

Mr. Arrich thanked participants for attending and asked for any last questions. Mr. Kirby reminded the Work Group of the coordination memo from then Resources Secretary Mike Chrisman in 2009. Coordination between major planning efforts such as the CVFPP and Bay Delta Conservation Plan is ongoing with a multi-program coordination workshop scheduled for September.

Adjourn